



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/673,905	10/23/2000	Klaus Gradischnig	SIEM0015U/US	7207

31518 7590 10/22/2003

NEIFELD IP LAW, PC
2001 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, QUANG N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2141

DATE MAILED: 10/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/673,905

Applicant(s)

GRADISCHNIG, KLAUS

Examiner

Quang N. Nguyen

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 October 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 October 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☒ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detail Action

1. This Office Action is in response to the Pre-Amendment filed on 10/23/2000.

Claims 1-10 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. **Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

4. Claim 10 cites "A method according to claim 6, further comprising the steps of: to said loop link at an output and input side by said signaling system.", which would be interpreted by the examiner as "A method according to claim 6, further comprising the steps of: employing said signaling system is a signaling system according to No. 7 and allocates a same network identifier to said loop link at an output and input side."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. **Claims 1-3, 5-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ferguson (US 5,521,902).**

7. As to claim 1, Ferguson teaches a signaling apparatus for processing signaling messages, comprising:

links via which the signaling apparatus is connected to other signaling apparatus, at least one signaling system that sends signaling messages to the other signaling apparatus or, respectively, receives signaling messages from the other signaling apparatus via said links (a plurality of link sets 18 interconnecting the Service Switching Points "SSPs" 11, Service Control Point "SCP" 13 and Service Transfer Points "STPs" 14 as in Fig. 1),

said signaling system that respectively allocates a signaling network identity to said links, e.g., the link 18A of Fig. 1 is uniquely identified or allocated by the triplet (8, 9, 1) (Ferguson, C4: L22-38);

at least one of said links that is returned in a loop from a signaling point to the signaling point as a loop link, different signaling network identities being allocated to the

Art Unit: 2141

loop link at an output and input side by the signaling system (Ferguson, Figs. 1-2 and corresponding text).

8. As to claim 2, Ferguson teaches the signaling apparatus of claim 1, wherein said signaling system, with assistance of a said loop link communicates signaling messages between two other signaling systems contained in the signaling to which is respectively provided an interface (Ferguson, C2: L44-45).

9. As to claim 3, Ferguson teaches the signaling apparatus of claim 1, wherein said signaling system generates internal load for test purposes (i.e., signaling link test messages are generated for test purposes) with assistance of said loop link (Ferguson, C5: L4-15).

10. As to claim 5, Ferguson teaches the signaling apparatus of claim 1, wherein said signaling system is a signaling system according to No. 7 (i.e., SS7 network 10 of Fig. 1) and allocates a same network identifier to said loop link (link 18A, 18B and 18C of Fig. 2) at the output and input side (signaling points PC = 8 and PC = 9) (Ferguson, Figs. 1-2).

11. Claims 6-8 and 10 are corresponding method claims of apparatus claims 1-3 and 5; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. **Claims 4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson (US 5,521,902), in view of Velamuri et al. (US 6,286,011), herein after referred as Velamuri.**

14. As to claim 4, Ferguson teaches the signaling apparatus of claim 1, but does not explicitly teach said signaling system realizes an interworking communication with other networks with assistance of a said loop link.

However, as well known in the art that in SS7 networks, Service Switching Points "SSPs" 11 and Service Transfer Parts "STPs" 14 were conventionally employed and allocated in different networks.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine and modify the teaching of Ferguson to utilize the assistance of a loop link at the SSPs and STPs in different networks to achieve an interworking communication with other networks because such Signal Transfer Points "STPs" (which are multi-port, high-speed packet switches that are

Art Unit: 2141

programmed to respond to the routing information and route a packet to its destination) were conventionally employed in the art to interconnect between networks via a SS7 data link.

15. Claim 9 is a corresponding method claim of apparatus claim 4; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

16. Further references of interest are cited on Form PTO-892, which is an attachment to this office action.

Art Unit: 2141


17. A shortened statutory period for reply to this action is set to expire THREE (3) months from the mailing date of this communication. See 37 CFR 1.134.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quang N. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-8190.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's SPE, Rupal Dharia, can be reached at (703) 305-4003. The fax phone number for the organization is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800/4700.

Quang N. Nguyen


RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER